



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,024	04/26/2001	Barry Appelman	06975-128001	6929

26171 7590 01/27/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
P.O. BOX 1022  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
----------

HARRELL, ROBERT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/842,024

Applicant(s)

APPELMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Robert B. Harrell

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1 November 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20051013.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: see attached Office Action.

Art Unit: 2142

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 15-20 are presented for examination.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
3. Each figure must be individually mentioned in the Brief Description Of The Drawings and not grouped as for figures 2-6 and figures 7-9.
4. The applicant should use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks <sup>TM</sup>, and other legal symbols ®, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically the claims (i.e., provide proper antecedent basis for “the” and “said” within each claim). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.
5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

***Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.***

6. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter since such reads on (encompass) printed matter and/or carrier waves as such lack being embodied on a computer readable storage medium (In re Beauregard (CAFC) 35 USPQ2d 1383) and MPEP 2106). However, “A computer program embodied on a computer readable storage medium” is more akin to Beauregard.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C 112:

***The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.***

8. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The scope of meaning of the following claim language is not clear:

- a) “users”—claim 1 (lines 1 and 3), claim 15 and claim 19;
- b) “type of access device”—claim 1 (lines 5 and 8), claim 15 and claim 19;
- c) “type of software”—claim 1 (lines 6 and 9), claim 15 and claim 19;

Art Unit: 2142

d) "information"—claim 1 (lines 7 and 13), claim 15 and claim 19.

9. As to 8 (a-d) above, these are but a few examples of numerous cases where clear antecedent basis are lacking and not an exhausting recital. Any term(s) or phrase(s) over looked by examiner and not listed above which start with either "the" or "said" and do not have a single proper antecedent basis also is indefinite for the reasons outlined in this paragraph. Also, these are but a few examples where term(s) or phrase(s) are introduced more than once without adequate use of either "the" or "said" for the subsequent use of the term(s) or phrase(s). Moreover, multiple introductions of a term, or changes in tense, results in a lack of clear antecedent basis for term(s) or phrase(s) which relied upon the introduced term. Failure to correct all existing cases where clear antecedent basis are lacking can be viewed as non-responsive. Nonetheless, should a response yield all claims allowable short *a few* cases where clear antecedent basis are lacking within the claims, a preemptive authorization to enter an examiner's amendment to the record to correct such would accelerate a notice of allowance over a final rejection. Such could be added at the end of an applicant's response with the following statement: "Examiner is hereby authorized, without the need of further contact by examiner, to enter an Examiner's Amendment to correct any cases where antecedent basis are lacking." if the applicant so elects. This does not diminish the applicant's requirement to correct all such cases not so listed in the example few given above nor prohibit any amendments after a notice of allowance by the applicant.

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this action:

**A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -**

**(e) the invention was described in — (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language;**

11. **Claim 1, 2, 4-11, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e)** as being anticipated by Burfeind et al. (United States Patent Number: US 6,360,172 B1).

12. Prior to addressing the grounds of the rejections below, should this application ever be the subject of public review by third parties not so versed with the technology (i.e., access to IFW through Public PAIR (as found on <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>)), this Office action will usually refer an applicant's attention to relevant and helpful elements, figures, and/or text upon which the Office action relies to support the position taken. Thus, the following citations are neither all-inclusive nor all-exclusive in nature *as the whole of the reference is cited*

Art Unit: 2142

and relied upon in this action as part of the substantial evidence of record. Also, no temporal order was claimed for the acts and/or functions.

13. Per claim 1, Burfeind taught a method (e.g., see col. 6 (line 55) for transmitting data (e.g., see Title) to one or more users (e.g., see figure 4 (490, 491, 492) and col. 11 (lines 11-23)) of a communications system (e.g., see figure 4), the method comprising:

- a) establishing a connection with one or more online users (e.g., see Abstract and figure 4);
- b) designating targeting rules applicable to the online users, the targeting rules designating at least a target geographic location (e.g., see Abstract) and at least one of a target type of access device (e.g., see col. 10 (line 44-et seq. but more specifically line 49)) **OR** a target type of software (e.g., see col. 9 (lines 11-16) in that software for email is different then for the others recited one lines 11-16 of col. 9);
- c) acquiring context information of the online users, the context information indicating at least geographic locations of the online users and at least one of a type of access device employed by the online users or a type of software employed by the online users (e.g., see col. 10 (line 44-et seq. but more specifically line 49)) ;
- d) applying the targeting rules to the context information to identify a subset of the online users that are associated with the target geographic location and who employ at least one of the target type of access device or the target type of software (e.g., see col. 10 (line 44-et seq. but more specifically line 49)) ;
- e) generating a message that contains information describing conditions in at least a portion of the target geographic location (e.g., see col. 10 (line 44-et seq. but more specifically line 49)) ; and,
- f) sending the message to the identified subset of the online users (e.g., see col. 10 (line 44-et seq. but more specifically line 49)).

14. Per claim 2, claim 4, claim 5, claim 6, claim 7, claim 8, claim 9, claim 10, and claim 11, the message was a weather condition(s) notification message per (e.g., see figure 11, figure 12, col. 8 (line 17-et seq.) and col. 10 (line 44-et seq. but more specifically line 49)) for online subscribers of a particular type of access device and/or particular type of software with parameters for ranking (i.e., voicemail and/or email are device specific and software dependent and in different ranks) connected to a host where the token was longitude and latitude of the geographic-location per col. 13 (line 64-et seq.) for example with voting established by desired preferences of figure 10 and figure 11 and figure 12 to allow the weather message to be routed to the subscribers.

15. Per claims 15-20, these claims do not teach or defined above the correspondingly rejected claims given above, and are thus rejected for the same reasons given above.

16. **A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).**


17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Harrell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3895. The

Art Unit: 2142

examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and on weekends from 6:00 am to 12 noon Eastern Standard Time.

18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell, can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for all papers is (703) 872-9306.

19. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



ROBERT B. HARRELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2142